

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/618,218	07/14/2003	Zyh-Ming Huang	SP3021-P-842-AAE 4416	
759	90 10/24/2006		EXAMINER	
HUNG ZYH-MING 235 Chung-Ho			GELAGAY, SHEWAYE	
P.O. BOX 10-69)		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Taipei,		•	2137	
TAIWAN			DATE MAILED: 10/24/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/618,218 ·	HUANG, ZYH-MING				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Shewaye Gelagay	2137				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting till apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 Ju This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pr					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	•					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcting 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	•					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat ity documents have been receiv I (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No red in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summan Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date				

Application/Control Number: 10/618,218 Page 2

Art Unit: 2137

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-5 have been examined.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The word "SACII" on page 3, line 9 should be changed to "ASCII", the word "secretary" on page 4, . line 5 should be changed to "security".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: It is unclear which part of the claim is the preamble. Appropriate action is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 3 recites, "the receiver is compatibly with the USB slot of a computer and is interacted with a computer", which is grammatically incoherent.

Furthermore, it is unclear if the receiver or the USB slot is compatibly interacting with a computer. Appropriate action is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 7. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Davis et al. (hereinafter Davis) U.S. Patent Number 6,088,450.

As per claim 1:

Davis teaches a wireless identification lock comprising a transmitter, (figure 1, item 120; col. 2, lines 38-57) a receiver (figure 1, item 110; figure 2, item 210; col. 2, lines 38-57) and a security software, the transmitter and receiver being communicated wirelessly; (col. 3, line 64-col. 4, line 5) the security software being associated with the operations of the transmitter and receiver. (col. 2, lines 38-57; col. 4, lines 12-19)

As per claim 2:

Davis teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Davis further discloses a wireless identification lock wherein the transmitter is formed by an IC circuit board, and transmits signals wirelessly, a casing enclose the IC circuit board for being carried easily. (figure 4; col. 5, lines 56-59)

As per claim 3:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 9. Claim 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al. (hereinafter Davis) U.S. Patent Number 6,088,450 in view of Rallis et al. (hereinafter Rallis) U.S. Patent Number 6,189,099.

Davis teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Davis further discloses a wireless identification lock wherein the receiver is formed by an IC circuit board, and receives signals wirelessly, a casing enclosing the IC circuit board for being carried easily; (figure 3; col. 5, lines 44-49) Davis does not explicitly disclose the receiver is compatibly with the USB slot of a computer and is interacted with a computer. Rallis in analogous art, however, discloses the receiver is compatibly with the USB slot of a computer and is interacted with a computer. (figure 1A, item 14; col. 4, lines 41-45) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by Davis with Rallis for faster communication between the receiver and the computer.

As per claims 4 and 5:

Davis teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. Davis does not explicitly disclose a wireless identification lock wherein the security software provides a

secret code input frame and related driving program for interacting with the receiver and transmitter. Rallis in analogous art, however, discloses wherein the security software provides a secret code input frame and related driving program for interacting with the receiver and transmitter. (col. 5, lines 9-67) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by Davis with Rallis in order to provide an application that will give an option to the user either automatic hard disk lock-up or computer power-down after expiration of a user-defined inactivity period. (col. 5, lines 18-22; Rallis)

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See Form PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shewaye Gelagay whose telephone number is 571-272-4219. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on 571-272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/618,218 Page 6

Art Unit: 2137

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Shewaye Gelagay

EMMANUEL L. MOISE SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER